

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7 and 9 are pending and under consideration. Claim 2 has been amended. On page 2 of the Office Action, claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,937,160 (Davis).

Davis is directed to a system, method, and computer program product for automatically revising a hypertext document stored within a server connected to a computer network via an e-mail message. An e-mail message containing revisions to a hypertext document is generated and includes identification of a markup tag contained within the hypertext document. The e-mail message is transmitted to the server hosting the hypertext document via the computer network. After authentication of the e-mail message, an identified markup tag within the hypertext document is replaced with revisions contained within the e-mail message. The revised hypertext document is then stored in a directory on the server.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9 is patentable over Davis, as Davis fails to disclose, "allowing the computer to generate the HTML document in accordance with specifications of the extended tag without maintaining the extended tag itself."

In contrast to the present invention, Davis does not generate HTML documents. Rather, David simply creates web page *changes* and transmits the changes via email. See Davis, column 8, lines 50-55 and 60-67. Therefore, Davis does not generate an HTML document in accordance with specifications of an extended tag without maintaining the extended tag. In fact, Davis does not generate HTML documents, period.

On page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, and 6-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,964,013 (Ono).

The Examiner's ground of rejection of claims 1, 2, and 6-7 based on section 103(a) is that Ono discloses deletion of an HTML tag pair while Davis does not disclose deletion of a <B> tag pair enclosing the <RPMTD> tag.

However, <B> tags are nothing other than that which is intentionally inserted by an operator with the intention of displaying their contents with bold font. The display is performed so that the <B> tags must will not be automatically deleted from the HTML document edited by the operator. Therefore, there is no motivation of adopting deletion of tag pairs disclosed by Ono to Davis for deleting <B> tags.

Further, as described in column 8, second paragraph of Ono, tags are deleted in accordance with the definition written by a user on the table. The reference is silent regarding a standard as to which tags are to be deleted and which tags and text are to remain.

In contrast, the present invention provides such a standard that tags satisfying a predetermined condition (i.e., they are a tag pair which encloses only an extended tag or a tag pair which encloses no element) among tags automatically inserted by the HTML editor are deleted (by claim 1), and that an identification extended tag pair added to the source HTML document in the editing step and their enclosing element (i.e., arbitrary text) except for the HTML tag relating to the character style, are deleted while leaving the HTML tag relating to the character style and the other tags.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 12-10-07

By: 

Reginald D. Lucas  
Registration No. 46,883

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501